



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,519	11/28/2000	John S. Hendricks	026880.00017	6858
4372 7590 12/20/2006 ARENT FOX PLLC 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER CHAI, LONGBIT	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/20/2006	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/722,519

Applicant(s)

HENDRICKS, JOHN S.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/28/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Presently, pending claims are 1 – 13 and 15 – 25.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is indefinite because the claim language "without user input" is considered to be unclear in the context and scope of its meaning about what exactly to constitute "without user input". Examiner notes according to the claim limitation as well as the disclosure from the specification, the subject matter of inventions indicates: "comparing a unique key associated with data text of the electronic book to the unique key identifying the electronic viewer". Therefore, "without user input", as recited in the claim, would have no way at all to, at least, generate a quest from the electronic viewer in order to further access the information / data text as claimed – i.e. comparing would not be started without the user input of access request.

Any other claims not addressed are rejected by virtue of their dependency should also be corrected.

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to instant claims 1 – 12 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection that is necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

2. As per claim 13, Applicant asserts Shwarts does not teach communicating the purchase of an electronic book. Examiner respectfully disagrees because Shwarts teaches communicating the purchase of an electronic book by the way of installing of an electronic book (Shwarts: Figure 2, 4 & 5, Column 2 Line 3 – 5 and Column 12 Line 1 – 5: the installation of an electronic book, e.g. encyclopedias (Column 1 Line 52), can be considered as a result of purchasing regardless the purchase type is either a free charge or not). Furthermore, Applicant asserts Shwarts does not teach “if the packet has a unique packet identifier, determining whether the packet identifier matches a library identifier of a library; and if the packet identifier matches the library identifier, storing the packet to a data file in a library storage”. Examiner respectfully disagrees because the determination whether the packet identifier is matched with the destination ID is always required before storing the packet to a data file in a library storage (MacPhail: Column 4 Line 40 – 43: the server library performs various services such as for storing and retrieving documents electronically (Column 4 Line 41 – 42) and thereby the packet identifier must match the library identifier to assure the correct destination of electronic document delivery – i.e. the librarian ID that is also the receiver when the book package / electronic book has arrived, as taught by Shwarts).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 102 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hartrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,428,529).

As per claim 1, Hartrick teaches a method of communicating between components of a home subsystem comprising a home library for receiving and storing electronic books (Hartrick : Column 1 Line 55 – Column 2 Line 2), the electronic books comprising data text and a unique key associated therewith (Hartrick : Column 4 Line 32 – 33: a password is embedded within the document), and a portable, electronic viewer for processing and displaying the electronic books, said portable viewer having a unique key associated therewith (Hartrick : Column 4 Line 31 – 45: Examiner notes a computer, such as a electronic viewer, is a collective entity of a human user and the computer as a whole; especially, when the viewer / user are requesting the access to data text from the computer), the method comprising:

In the library, comparing a unique key associated with data text of the electronic book to the unique key identifying the electronic viewer (Hartrick: Column 1 Line 51 –

Art Unit: 2131

Column 2 Line 12 and Column 4 Line 31 – 42: (a) the password embedded within the structured document text is considered as an unique key and (b) the unique password is identifying the collective entity of a human user and the electronic viewer, as a whole during the comparison when the viewer / user are requesting the access to data text from the electronic viewer).

if the comparing step produces a match, sending the data text related to an electronic book from the library to the electronic viewer and storing the data text in the electronic viewer (Hartrick: Column 4 Line 42 – 45: sending the document to the display; where display is indeed the electronic viewer and the data text must be stored first in the display; otherwise, it would not be possible to be viewed by the user).

As per claim 11, Hartrick teaches the data text is transmitted as a digital bit stream (Hartrick: Column 1 Line 51).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2131

4. Claims 2 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,428,529), in view of Choudhury (U.S. Patent 5,509,074).

As per claim 2, Hartrick does not teach encrypting the data text.

Choudhury teaches encrypting the data text (Choudhury: Column 2 Line 62 – 64).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Choudhury within the system of Hartrick because (a) Hartrick discloses a problem of one-line electronic book system with the lack of adequate means to protect the documents and enforce the user's intentions for the treatment of his electronic books or documents (Hartrick: Column 1 Line 65 – Column 2 Line 6) and (b) Choudhury further teaches an enhanced and improved security solution by using a copy-right server integrated with the document server (as an integrated one-line document library, as a whole) to impose appropriate and enhanced forms of security treatment such as encryption / decryption techniques to authenticate the users for accessing the requested documents (Choudhury: Column 2 Line 42 – 61).

As per claim 5, Hartrick does not teach preventing the electronic viewer from outputting decompressed data text.

Choudhury teaches preventing the electronic viewer from outputting decompressed data text (Choudhury: Column 6 Line 15 – 17). See same rationale of combination applied herein as above in rejecting the claim 2.

As per claim 3 and 6, Hartrick as modified teaches preventing the electronic viewer from outputting decrypted data text (Choudhury: Column 3 Line 10 – 11 and Column 4 Line 31 – 32).

As per claim 4 and 7, Hartrick as modified teaches displaying the data text on a display portion of the electronic viewer; and decrypting the data text as the data text is displayed (Choudhury: Column 3 Line 44 – 45 and Column 4 Line 25 – 31: Choudhury teaches once the displayer receives the encrypted document, the device decrypts it and displays it (Column 4 Line 25 – 26). Examiner notes the device (either screen displayer or printer) must use microprogram memory buffer (or memory page) to perform the functions of decrypting and displaying electronic documents and accommodate the screen display buffer / page one at a time).

As per claim 8, Hartrick does not teach the data text is encrypted and compressed when it is received by the electronic viewer, and further comprising decompressing and decrypting a portion of the data text.

Choudhury teaches the data text is encrypted and compressed when it is received by the electronic viewer, and further comprising decompressing and decrypting a portion of the data text (Choudhury: Column 6 Line 15 – 17). See same rationale of combination applied herein as above in rejecting the claim 2.



As per claim 9, Hartrick does not teach encrypting and compressing the data text before it is sent to the electronic viewer, and further comprising decompressing and decrypting the data text one page at a time, as a current page is displayed on the electronic viewer.

Choudhury teaches encrypting and compressing the data text before it is sent to the electronic viewer, and further comprising decompressing and decrypting the data text one page at a time, as a current page is displayed on the electronic viewer (Choudhury: Column 3 Line 44 – 45 and Column 4 Line 25 – 31: Choudhury teaches once the displayer receives the encrypted document, the device decrypts it and displays it (Column 4 Line 25 – 26). Examiner notes the device (either screen displayer or printer) must use microprogram memory buffer (or memory page) to perform the functions of decrypting and displaying electronic documents and accommodate the screen display buffer / page one at a time). See same rationale of combination applied herein as above in rejecting the claim 2.

As per claim 10, Hartrick does not teach the electronic viewer has a unique key for decrypting the data text, whereby only one electronic viewer can access a particular transmission of data text.

Choudhury teaches the electronic viewer has a unique key for decrypting the data text, whereby only one electronic viewer can access a particular transmission of data text (Choudhury: Column 1 Line 46 – 61). See same rationale of combination applied herein as above in rejecting the claim 2.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,428,529), in view of Boulton (U.S. Patent 4,985,697).

As per claim 12, Hartrick does not teach the data text is transmitted from a remote cable headend to the library and bundled into a data file, which data file is sent to the electronic viewer.

Boulton teaches the data text is transmitted from a remote cable headend to the library and bundled into a data file, which data file is sent to the electronic viewer (Boulton: see for example, Column 10 Line 63 – 65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Boulton within the system of Hartrick because Boulton teaches a cable TV transmission technique for electronic book applications.

6. Claims 13 and 17 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shwartz et al. (U.S. Patent: 6,243,071), in view of MacPhail (U.S. Patent: 5,089,956).

As per claim 13, Shwartz teaches a method for processing text data for an electronic book in an electronic book home system comprising a library and an electronic viewer (Shwartz: Figure 2, Column 2 Line 3 – 5 and Column 12 Line 1 – 5), the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2131

Communicating the purchase of an electronic book (Shwartz: Figure 2, 4 & 5, Column 2 Line 3 – 5 and Column 12 Line 1 – 5: the installation of an electronic book, e.g. encyclopedias (Column 1 Line 52), can be considered as a result of purchasing regardless the purchase type is either a free charge or not);

Shwartz teaches the purchaser's library ID is equivalent to the librarian ID that is also the receiver when the book package / electronic book has arrived (Shwartz: Figure 5 & Column 12 Line 48 – 55: to install the book into the electronic book unit, it must be in a form as a message (or a packet)). However, Shwartz does not disclose expressly attaching a unique packet identifier that matches a library identifier associated with the purchaser's library to a packet of text data.

MacPhail teaches attaching a unique packet identifier that matches a library identifier associated with the purchaser's library to a packet of text data (MacPhail: Column 4 Line 27 – 31 and Column 58 – 64: a DIA communication protocol must be carried out by using a message / packet with the packet identifier that uniquely identifies the receiver – i.e. the librarian ID that is also the receiver when the book package / electronic book has arrived, as taught by Shwartz).

After the unique packet identifier is attached, receiving a packet of text data (MacPhail: Column 1 Line 38 – 49 and Column 4 Line 27 – 31: MacPhail discloses the benefits of electronic document processing can be realized from a network between an electronic viewer and a library server);

determining whether the packet has a unique packet identifier (MacPhail: Column 1 Line 38 – 42, Column 4 Line 26 – 31 and Column 2 Line 61 – 63: each packet of the

Art Unit: 2131

network must have a unique ID in order to transmit the indicated documents to the identified recipient end user such that the relationship of documents is maintained (Column 2 Line 61 – 63));

if the packet has a unique packet identifier, determining whether the packet identifier matches a library identifier of a library; and if the packet identifier matches the library identifier, storing the packet to a data file in a library storage (MacPhail: Column 4 Line 40 – 43: the server library performs various services such as for storing and retrieving documents electronically (Column 4 Line 41 – 42) and thereby the packet identifier must match the library identifier to assure the correct destination of electronic document delivery – i.e. the librarian ID that is also the receiver when the book package / electronic book has arrived, as taught by Shwarts).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of MacPhail within the system of Shwarts because MacPhail teaches an effective mechanism distributing, filing and retrieving the documents over distributed networks (MacPhail: Column 2 Line 51 – 64 and Column 1 Line 38 – 49).

As per claim 17, Shwarts as modified teaches determining whether the data file has been opened (MacPhail: see for example, Column 1 Line 38 – 50, Column 1 Line 50 – 52 and Column 1 Line 61 – 65: The data file must be opened before the data can be stored from the packet) , and

Art Unit: 2131

if the data file has been not been opened, opening the data file; and storing the packet to the data file (MacPhail: see for example, Column 1 Line 38 – 50, Column 1 Line 50 – 52 and Column 1 Line 61 – 65: The data file must be opened before the data can be stored from the packet).

As per claim 18, Shwarts as modified teaches determining whether the packet is a final packet received for an electronic book (MacPhail: see for example, Column 1 Line 38 – 50, Column 1 Line 50 – 52 and Column 1 Line 61 – 65: The data file must be closed after the data written has been completed),

if the packet is the final packet, closing the data file; and updating a directory (MacPhail: see for example, Column 1 Line 38 – 50, Column 1 Line 50 – 52 and Column 1 Line 61 – 65: The data file must be closed after the data written has been completed).

As per claim 19, Shwarts as modified teaches sending the data file to an electronic viewer (MacPhail: see for example, Column 2 Line 60 – 64).

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shwarts et al. (U.S. Patent: 6,243,071), in view of MacPhail (U.S. Patent: 5,089,956), in view of Boulton (U.S. Patent: 4985697).

As per claim 15, Shwarts as modified does not teach the packet is transmitted as a digital bit stream from a remote cable headend to the library.

Art Unit: 2131

Boulton teaches the packet is transmitted as a digital bit stream from a remote cable headend to the library (Boulton: see for example, Column 10 Line 63 – 65).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Boulton within the system of Shwarts as modified because Boulton teaches a cable TV transmission technique for electronic book applications.

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shwarts et al. (U.S. Patent: 6,243,071), in view of MacPhail (U.S. Patent: 5,089,956), in view of Feigenbaum (U.S. Patent: 4,644,470).

As per claim 16, Shwarts as modified does not teach if the packet does not have a unique packet identifier, storing the packet to an electronic message file.

Feigenbaum teaches if the packet does not have a unique packet identifier, storing the packet to an electronic message file (Feigenbaum: see for example, Column 4 Line 45).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Feigenbaum within the system of Shwarts as modified because Feigenbaum teaches a method of allowing data processing systems to adopt names on either a unique or non-unique basis, which would in effect be transparent to the user if it is a non-unique name for broadcast

Art Unit: 2131

messages (Feigenbaum: see for example, Column 2 Line 21 – 24 and Column 2 Line 13 – 15).

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shwarts et al. (U.S. Patent: 6,243,071), in view of MacPhail (U.S. Patent: 5,089,956), and in view of Choudhury (U.S. Patent: 5509074).

As per claim 20, MacPhail does not teach encrypting and compressing the data file.

Choudhury teaches encrypting and compressing the packet (Choudhury: see for example, Column 1 Line 43 – 61: A on-line document server is equivalent to a document library of the home users and the copy-right server is used to impose appropriate forms of security treatment to authenticate the users for accessing the requested documents).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Choudhury within the system of Shwarts as modified because Choudhury teaches an enhanced and improved security mechanism for on-line document server systems by using a copy-right server integrated with the document server (as an integrated one-line document library) to impose appropriate forms of security treatment to authenticate the users for accessing the requested documents (Choudhury: see for example, Column 2 Line 42 – 61).

Art Unit: 2131

10. Claims 21 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohara et al. (U.S. Patent: 5,739,814), in view of Choudhury (U.S. Patent: 5,509,074).

As per claim 21, Ohara teaches a method for processing data text for electronic books in an electronic book home system comprising a library and an electronic viewer (Ohara: Figure 9, Column 1 Line 61 – 65 and Column 2 Line 15 – 27), the method comprising:

Ohara teaches the text data is inserted into a video signal when operating the electronic books (Ohara: Column 2 Line 58 – 64). However, Ohara does not disclose expressly sending a packet of data text, inserted in a video signal, from a remote operations center to the library.

Choudhury teaches sending a packet of data text, inserted in a video signal, from a remote operations center to the library (Ohara: Column 2 Line 58 – 64 & Choudhury: Column 1 Line 37 and Figure 1 Element 3 discloses the electronic document networking techniques. Copyright Server and Document Server are qualified to serve as the remote operations center and the document library respectively. The user is qualified as an electronic viewer. The necessity of networking techniques, shown in Figure 1, depends upon the close physical proximity between the source and destination entities);

encrypting and compressing the packet (Choudhury: Column 1 Line 43 – 61);

sending the packet to an electronic viewer communicatively coupled to the library (Choudhury: Column 1 Line 43 – 61);



Art Unit: 2131

storing the packet in an electronic viewer storage (Choudhury: Column 1 Line 43 – 61);

decompressing and decrypting the packet, comprising decompressing and decrypting an electronic book by page, just before a page is displayed on the display of the electronic viewer (Choudhury: Column 3 Line 44 – 45 and Column 4 Line 25 – 31: Choudhury teaches once the displayer receives the encrypted document, the device decrypts it and displays it (Column 4 Line 25 – 26). Examiner notes the device (either screen displayer or printer) must use microprogram memory buffer (or memory page) to perform the functions of decrypting and displaying electronic documents and accommodate the screen display buffer / page one at a time);

displaying the data text on a display of the electronic viewer (Choudhury: Column 3 Line 44 – 45 and Column 4 Line 25 – 31).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Choudhury within the system of Hartrick because (a) Ohara teaches operating an electronic book through an external device (Ohara: Column 1 Line 60 – 65) and (b) Choudhury teaches an effective security solution to enhance appropriate forms of security treatment to authenticate the users for accessing the requested documents (Choudhury: Column 2 Line 42 – 61).

As per claim 22, Ohara as modified teaches storing the packet to a data file in the library, which data file is capable of storing a plurality of packets related to an electronic book (Choudhury: Column 1 Line 43 – 61).

As per claim 23, Ohara as modified teaches encrypting and compressing the packet comprises encrypting and compressing the data file, and wherein the step of sending the packet to the electronic viewer comprises sending the data file to the electronic viewer (Choudhury: Column 1 Line 43 – 61).

As per claim 24, Ohara as modified teaches the data packet is sent in a bit stream having a packet identifier, and further comprising comparing a packet identifier with a library identifier, and wherein the step of sending the packet to the library comprises sending the packet to the library if the packet identifier matches the library identifier (Choudhury: Column 1 Line 43 – 61).

As per claim 25, Ohara as modified teaches decompressing and decrypting the data file comprises using a security key unique to the electronic viewer (Choudhury: see for example, Column 1 Line 46).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
LBC

Longbit Chai  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2131

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100